

**ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**  
**MINUTES OF WORK SESSION**  
**January 5, 1995**

**FACILITATOR:** Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Linda Murakami called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

**Board/Ex-Officio members present:** Alan Aluisi, Gale Biggs, Jim Burch, Jan Burda, Lloyd Casey, Ralph Coleman, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Gislinde Engelmann, Tom Gallegos, Kathryn Johnson, Jack Kraushaar, Albert Lambert, Linda Murakami, David Navarro, Richard Seebass, Reginald Thomas, Gary Thompson, Beverly Lyne Wilber, Tom Marshall, Leanne Smith, Steve Tarlton

**Board/Ex-Officio members absent:** Lorraine Anderson, Stuart Asay, Chuck Clark

**Public/observers present:** Kenneth Werth (citizen); Karen Wiemelt (CH2M Hill); Chris Dayton (ICF Kaiser); Melody C. Bell (DOE-AMOWM); Sheldon Anderson (EG&G); Tom DuPont (citizen); Thayer F. Masoner (citizen); Liz Cone (ASG); Chris Timm (ICF Kaiser); Sujit Gupta (EG&G); Hank Stovall (Health Advisory Panel); Deanne Butterfield (RFLID); E. Baracani (Suerdrup Environmental); Drake Fink (citizen); Jill Paukert (EG&G); Carl Mitcham (Colorado School of Mines); Marylee Mitcham (citizen); Pete Holland (Parsons); David Michel (S.M. Stoller); Ann Sieben (ICF Kaiser); Regina Sarter (DOE); Jessie Roberson (DOE); Jessica Roberson (citizen); Mike Freeman (citizen); Tom Gibbons (AlphaTRAC); John Corsi (ECA); Ann Moss (Shapins Associates); Kathaleen Bechard (DOE); Tom Clark (citizen); Gregg Nishimoto (DOE); Joelle Klein (DOE)

**PRESENTATION/PANEL DISCUSSION:**

1) Leanne Smith (DOE) gave a presentation on the following of DOE's liability reduction activities:

- **Shrink the Protected Area.** DOE hopes to have all special nuclear material stored in Building 371 in a safe, stable form. In order for this to happen, DOE must thermally stabilize, brush and repack special nuclear materials to reduce the liability, and reduce the inventory in other buildings by relocating to Building 371.
- **Waste Disposal.** Their goal is to safely remove waste from the RFETS in its entirety. The main concern is to prevent release of wastes, in order to protect workers.
- **Liquid Stabilization.** DOE plan: to have all actinide bearing solutions removed from tanks and ancillary piping systems to safe storage, and all residue tanks closed. There is a potential for criticality, environmental release and worker exposure.
- **Excess Materials.** Goal: to have all excess materials identified, characterized and reached final disposition. Some liabilities include chemicals, and plutonium and other material vulnerabilities.
- **Residue Stabilization.** This is a newly identified liability reduction activity. DOE's vision: solid residues are in a safe storage configuration awaiting offsite disposal. Safety issues include gas generation and drum/packaging corrosion.

Liability Reduction Activity Teams have been established. Teams are in the planning phase at this time. DOE is requesting CAB's assistance in providing perspective on liabilities and priorities for each of these areas, assistance with identifying "how clean is clean," input on where to put the plutonium, and help with activities DOE does not know how to do yet.

2) Regina Sarter (DOE) followed up with a briefing on **ER 2000 (Accelerated Cleanup)** activities. The mission is accelerated startup and completion of reducing significant risk to health and the environment, as well as focusing on physical cleanup. Short-term vision: close OUs 1, 11, 15 and 16 by end of 1995. Long-term vision: close all 16 operable units in Interagency Agreement by the year 2000. Environmental restoration will cleanup sites that are no longer needed for any type of operation, as well

**ADMIN RECORD**

**SW-A-005731**

as sites that are not directly tied to decontamination and decommissioning activities. Through this process, it is anticipated that there will be a cost savings of several billion dollars. One success story of accelerated cleanup activities is OU1 - Hot Spot Removal, which was completed in September of 1994, and the contamination was removed in six areas. Another highlight is OU10, 964 Yard cleanup, the first phase of this activity was completed by removing and disposing of materials from a storage yard. An Accelerated Cleanup Working Group has been established, and CAB staff participates on behalf of the Board. Some of the future planned activities for 1995: hot spot removal, initiate no further action for some of the sites, do quite a few tank removals, and possibly the closure of the old landfill in OU5. Success criteria for the future: complete 10 accelerated cleanup projects by the end of 1995, 20 by the end of 1996, and 40 by the end of 1997.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS:

### 1) Executive Committee

- Announcements:
  - Gale Biggs and Richard Seebass have resigned from the Board.
  - National SSAB meeting in February - Beverly Lyne Wilber has expressed interest in attending, but only five Board members may attend. Previously it was decided that Board members who have attended other out-of-state meetings will defer to those who have not. The six interested will work out who will attend.
  - CERE Risk Evaluation meeting in Salt Lake City (January 31-February 1) - Gale Biggs was to attend, but has now resigned. Jim Burch is interested in attending.
  - David Navarro has resigned as co-chair of both the Community Outreach Committee and Alternative Use Planning Committee. Other Board members are encouraged to apply to serve as co-chair of either committee.
- **Recommendation:** Approve Conflict of Interest policy as drafted by Tom Gallegos and Beverly Lyne Wilber. Issues identified: (1) is it necessary to have last sentence in first paragraph - this issue may be covered by CAB policy on representation; (2) change section (c) in second paragraph to "recommend to the Board"; (3) which part of bylaws will be updated to reflect new policy; (4) are there corporate general ethical standards - definition?  
**Action:** Tom Gallegos and Eugene DeMayo will get together and rewrite policy and bring back to Board for review/approval.

### 2) FACA Committee

- The committee developed a list of options, and focused on the problems with compliance with FACA - loss of credibility and independence due to DOE's control of agendas and membership. The committee is awaiting response from a few organizations who have been contacted regarding whether the preferred options are available to the CAB. Next meeting will be Monday, January 16 (6 p.m.?).

### 3) Alternative Use Planning Committee

- **Recommendation:** Approve any identified sections in recommendation regarding CAB's participation in the NCPP public involvement process.  
**Action:** Move to approve only sections 1a); and section 3) with the exception that the first sentence be deleted. APPROVED. The committee may decide on its own regarding section 1b) and designate a liaison to attend the NCPP public outreach subcommittee meetings (and provide updates to the Board). Section 2) was not approved.

### 4) Community Outreach Committee

- CAB Public Outreach Plan has been revised to include comments from last month's Board meeting.
- Newsletter - Erin is managing editor, Linda is executive editor, and Executive Committee will provide final review and approval.
- **Recommendation:** Approve letter of support regarding NEWNET/COMRAD.  
**Action:** Motion to accept. APPROVED.

- 5) Plutonium and Special Nuclear Materials Committee
- *Nightline* was present at the December committee meeting. Bill Rask presented information on plutonium vulnerability. LeRoy presented his letter suggesting regulatory oversight of plutonium by CDPHE. There were some concerns expressed regarding this suggestion.
- 6) Environmental/Waste Management Committee
- Update on liquid stabilization and solar pond closures - the committee is reviewing comments and preparing a recommendation on both projects. Also began workplan items - preparing presentation to Board later this year. The committee will select and recommend a new co-chair to replace Gale.
- 7) Membership Committee
- **Recommendation:** Approve selection of Jan Burda as chair of the Membership Committee.  
**Action:** Motion to accept. APPROVED.
  - Board members were sent a memo from the Membership Committee regarding key areas of expertise that need to be replaced on Board membership - CAB members were encouraged to contact committee members with any further suggestions.
  - **Recommendation:** Revise bylaw section regarding Board member attendance. Many Board members expressed concern with this recommendation, and felt that the clause regarding excused absences should remain in the bylaws.  
**Action:** Recommendation was not approved. More close enforcement of the current policy will be followed in the future (i.e., review of excuses by both chair and vice-chair to determine if they are acceptable).
  - **Recommendation:** Approve minimum level of involvement for Board members. Several concerns were expressed that it would be difficult to apply a minimum level of involvement without any policy for enforcement. Attendance at Board retreats would count the same as attendance at a monthly Board meeting; however, there is no enforcement for participation on working committees.  
**Action:** Membership Committee will rewrite policy including enforcement, and return to Board with recommendation.
  - **Recommendation:** Approve replacement level for Board vacancies.  
**Action:** Motion to accept. APPROVED.

#### NEXT MEETING:

Date: February 2, 1995, 6 - 9:30 p.m.  
Location: Westminster City Hall, Multi-Purpose Room  
Agenda: • *Future Site Use Working Group*

#### ACTION ITEM SUMMARY:

- 1) Rewrite conflict of interest policy
- 2) Rewrite recommendation re: minimum level of involvement

#### ASSIGNED TO:

Eugene DeMayo & Tom Gallegos  
Membership Committee

#### MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10 P.M.

\* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.

**QUESTION AND ANSWER / PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD TO LIABILITY REDUCTION  
ACTIVITIES PRESENTATION:**

**Comment:** Regarding identifying "how clean is clean" - that's up to DOE to determine the cost benefit, whether the costs of cleaning up it are more expensive than reimbursing for the loss of the land.

**Question:** Have you done any studies to determine what sources will be included in your shrinking of the PA?

**Answer:** What we hope to do is enhance the capabilities of cleaning up the residues by removing source from buildings.

**Comment:** Rather than "how clean is clean" - that's a question for the future, and I think the question for today is "how safe is Rocky Flats."

**Question:** If there is a criticality during liquid stabilization, what would be the result?

**Answer:** I don't know the specifics, but there would be a burst of neutrons, and there could be worker fatalities.

**Question:** What is the timeframe for reducing the PA, and what buildings will then be in the protected area?

**Answer:** The timeframe/goal is through 1998, and Building 371 and its support buildings will be in the protected area.

**Question:** What are the support buildings?

**Answer:** Any buildings that have maintenance activities - small buildings that provide some of the support systems. Building 374 is next to 371, it is a waste management building and will stay in the protected area. All other plutonium buildings will be outside the protected area.

**Question:** What do you do to manage the plutonium if you move all the plutonium in 371?

**Answer:** DOE has come up with a long-term storage management target.

**Question:** How does Rocky Flats have the disposal of residues as wastes slated, when the PEIS covering special nuclear materials has not yet been completed?

**Answer:** The residues at Rocky Flats are deemed as waste, particularly if they have a RCRA constituent in them - that was a Colorado decision, not a complex decision. I would like the Environmental, Safety and Health team to discuss this with headquarters and get an answer to you.

**Question:** It would be helpful to have information on which mechanism will administer the decision - whether it's the PEIS, also the State of Colorado has authority to make decisions on residues, it's unclear. The same with low-level mixed waste - FFCA, Site Specific Treatment Plans, the National Treatment Plans, and a decision also apparently administered through the PEIS.

**Answer:** If there is a residue with sufficient concentration of plutonium so that it cannot safely be disposed of in that form, then it may be required to take some of the actinides out of the residues. So we may have to do some of the segregation and removal, and that would fall under the PEIS for nuclear material management.

**Question:** Has the vulnerability assessment study, or anything else, altered the plans to consolidate everything in Building 371? There were some rumors that 991 may be utilized for some storage.

**Answer:** That building will not be used for storage, to our knowledge, except possibly for residues. Also, because of the distance between those buildings, that would defeat the purpose of trying to shrink the protected area.

**Question:** How much longer is EG&G going to have a say in what goes on in the decision-making at Rocky Flats?

**Answer:** EG&G's contract runs out the end of this year, but we are accelerating contract reform to award new contracts in the April timeframe of this year. The changeover of contractors will be about May-June of this year.

**Question:** Is EG&G still making decisions?

**Answer:** Yes, they are making technical decisions.

**Question:** If EG&G is pulling out of the operations, why aren't you getting more representatives from the potential contractors to meet with this board and start giving ideas on how they are going to clean it up?

**Answer:** That is happening, but the mechanism to do that is through our Source Evaluation Board, and the group of individuals that are evaluating the proposals that have been submitted by the contractors. That process is occurring, it just can't occur in the public domain at this point.

**Question:** EG&G is telling me there will never be a nuclear waste site at the plant.

**Answer:** If you'll look at the NEPA documentation, we don't really have the framework to show that there will be a lot of nuclear waste disposal occurring at Rocky Flats.

**Question:** Rocky Flats sits a half mile from the Leyden coal mine, where they are storing over a trillion cubic feet of natural gas. BF&I also has a land disposal site out there, and it's accumulating a lot of methane gas. If a criticality ever happens, it's going to blow.

**Answer:** I don't understand the mechanism for that. Maybe it would be good to go over in more depth the properties of plutonium and criticality.

**Question:** How long is this going to be stored in Building 371?

**Answer:** About a 20-25 year timeframe. After that, our expectation is the NEPA documentation will have been completed, that a site would be identified, and there will be a facility built to receive the material.

**Question:** Are there any contingency plans on going back in and reprocessing or reusing the plutonium in the future?

**Answer:** No, we do not believe we need to reprocess that material.

**Question:** Have you developed any interface documents yet about who will be doing what?

**Answer:** I don't know that I've ever seen that. I'd like to ask the NEPA people to provide that.

**Question:** Is the work logic at the integrated level or the team level?

**Answer:** The direction we're going in is a sitewide integrated baseline. But right now we are working on a team level. It's both a bottom-up and top-down structure.

**Comment:** In five years of working on cleanup at Rocky Flats, what has been accomplished? There has been very little action from what I can tell. If I were a manager at Rocky Flats, I wouldn't need an advisory board to tell me how to clean up out there. Advisory boards just submit a report, and somebody reads it and files it. What is needed is a groundswell, and get some action from Congress or Washington. This is Congress' problem. The mission for this group should be how best to put pressure on Congress.

**Comment:** Everything I've been told is that the situation out there is dire - much worse than it was four years ago. Why isn't anything being done? This is my last meeting, and one reason I'm leaving is that I don't believe we are being very effective.

**Response:** I agree that not enough is being done - that things aren't going very fast. The essential thing to remember is that there are no good answers to the problems faced at Rocky Flats. So when decisions are being made, often they are a compromise. It is an impossible situation, and very

frustrating. Hopefully we will be able to come up with better decisions than we would have if we didn't put the effort in.

**Comment:** We talk a lot about situations that may take place five or 10 years from now. If we have an accident in the next six months or year, and if we delay doing something that should be done because we were worried about 25 or 100 years from now, we made a very big mistake.

#### **QUESTION AND ANSWER / PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD TO ACCELERATED CLEANUP PRESENTATION:**

**Question:** Are we missing some activities in accelerated cleanup - such as onsite closure of some of the facilities? Are there any studies that would indicate, for instance, how do we know that you're not engaging in activities where we may have to come back in 20 years and spend 100 times as much to cleanup because it was not a good place to do closure.

**Answer:** One of the reasons that we instituted the PAM process is to get public input. But I don't know if there is such a study.

**Question:** What percentage of the overall risk to public health has been reduced by the accelerated cleanups that have been done so far? My feeling is that hot spot removal is a very small reduction in overall site risk, and that what's needed is an evaluation of where the major sources of risk to public health and safety are.

**Answer:** We can get information to you on the risk reduction from hot spot removal. And that's something the working group has discussed - working on projects that are clearly risk-based. We will look at some projects that we know have a high risk base, such as some of the PCBs, as well as liquid/solvent extraction in OU2.

**Question:** I feel that accelerated cleanup may translate into incomplete cleanup or dirty closure. And I'm not convinced that this will be done by the year 2000. We know that DOE is cutting its cleanup budget. I'm concerned that we will end up with a partially cleaned site with risks somewhat reduced, and no more money to clean it up. How does this accelerated cleanup plan fit into the overall plan to cleanup the site? What is the perspective of the regulators?

**Answer:** The accelerated cleanup plan ties in directly to our overall plan. The budget is in place, all accelerated cleanup activities identified are funded - not mortgaged. CDPHE: is interested in and supports accelerated cleanup actions. We are also concerned about long-term issues. EPA: We also support cleanup actions, but have expressed concern over taking actions to addressing the lowest risks in accelerated fashion, potentially at the expense of higher risk activities.

**Comment:** Your priorities seem to be focused on ease of cleanup, rather than what is the most hazardous.  
**Response:** We're trying to get the bits and pieces to finalize whatever actions need to be done for a particular operable unit. We have to start somewhere.

**Comment:** Regarding the latest budget cuts proposed, we may lose \$50-\$100 million at the site, and the brunt of that may be on ER projects. I'd like to request for a future presentation is something about what process is being used to prioritize.

**Response:** One thing suggested was that the next thing that should happen is to agree on a goal for each operable unit. In addition, those priorities will be addressed in the RFCA.